

The

Philanthropist.

PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

GAMALIEL BAILEY, JR., Editor.

VOLUME I. NO. 6. NEW SERIES.

We are verily guilty concerning our brother • • • • therefore is this distress come upon us.

SAMUEL A. ALLEY, Printer.

THE PHILANTHROPIST,
PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
N. W. corner of Main & Sixth streets,
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

JULIUS O. BEARDSLEE, Publishing Agent.
TERMS.—Three Dollars and fifty cents in advance.—
Three Dollars if paid till the expiration of the year. Letters
on business should be directed to the Publishing Agent,
those relating to the editorial department, to the Editor.
In all cases post paid.

POETRY.

For the Philanthropist.

THE ESCAPE OF THE SLAVE.
BY J. R. HANNAH.

“dexter parsus Iulus
Impicit, sequitur patrem non passibus equis.
Pone sub conjux. Ferimus per opacum locorum:
Et me, quem dudum non ulla iuncta movebat
Tela, neque aduerso glomerati ex agmine Graui;
Nunc omnes terret sora, sonus excitat omnia
Suspensum, et pariter coniuncti oneris, timentem.
Virgil.

The Winter-green raised up its starry-shaped head
Above the grey moss where the rose-tree lay dead;
And it seemed to gaze at the cold blue North
From whence the chill breezes came murmuring forth.

Look, look! for the trees are a forest of sheen,
For the frost's busy finger hath salvered the scene;
And the ice-laden branches droop sadly and bright,
Like an unwilling bride deck'd in crystal and white.

Thus she wastes in the eye of her lover; opprest
By the weight of her brilliants and gem-studded vest;
Well knowing, like ice, in the gaze of the sun,
They will melt off in tears when the wedding is done.

Who yonder, glides close by the skirt of the wood,
Where the anchorcane darkens the winter-cold frost?
No felon he seems by the prayer he hath said—
No coward—I know by the grasp of his blade.

Yet the snow-bird's last chirp made his quick pulses start,
And his eye told the terror that lurked at his heart;
Ay! that female besides him—that child clinging near—
At the fire of his hope and the frost of his fear.

And the river is cross'd—for his firm shoulder bore
That wife and that child to the opposite shore;
Where the wolf, that his tyrant more merciful far,
In the deep-thatched thicket laid them his lair.

But the meek moon is out on her path-way so cold,
And the frost-flower is bright with its star-beans of gold;
Then away, in the warm'ness of Freedom, they lie,
Though enameled' with ice, a piñoles sky.

God speed ye, poor exiles of innocence! Flee!
For the hound and the hound, wound in answering glee,
Drown the shout of the hunter, the snort of his steed—
O, away then, away then, or death is your meet!

And well have ye sped—for the broad stream is past,
Whose marge is to Slavery's footsteps, the last:
And the rent of your tyrant is slack'd on the shore,
And his course curse is quelled in NIAGARA'S Roar.

Then be it anthem, O freedom, to God—
“O bright be His rain-bow and green be His sod;
May the song, His waters eternally swell,
The Tyrant's last curse and his Bondman's “Farewell!”

ANTI-SLAVERY.

LETTER OF GERRIT SMITH.

We have just received a neat pamphlet, containing

a letter addressed by Gerrit Smith to Hon. Guillian C. Verplanck, member of the New York Legislature. Its object is to attract attention to the laws of that State, in relation to the colored population.

We should be very glad to republish the whole of this interesting letter, but so many other things demand notice, we shall be obliged to confine ourselves to a few extracts.

“Peterboro, Dec. 12, 1837.

HON. JULIAN C. VERPLANCK:

Dear Sir.—I learn from newspapers and other sources,

that great and various benefits are looked for from the ascendancy of the political party, which has given you so triumphant election, and enabled you to be multiplied

to be your friends and enemies, and to be multiplied

to be poured into every department of industry;

and, in short, all traces of the past years of commercial calamities

are to disappear in the flood of prosperity, which is to

come upon us. Be assured, sir, that the fact of my not having

contributed to the political revolution, which gave birth

to these joyful anticipations, will in no degree diminish my happiness in their realization. I am not sensible that my interest in the comfort and prosperity of my fellow-citizens was greater, whilst I was a political partisan, than it has been

the last nine years, during which I have not attended a political meeting, or acted with a political party.

Whatever may be in attachment to political parties, there is, nevertheless, nothing in my own experience to justify the opinion, that a man ceases to care for the interests and welfare of his countrymen, when he withdraws from the

circle of his friends, as a statesman and a scholar?

It is fit to be peculiarly mindful of the need, when we are unusually blessed ourselves. So thought Nehemiah, when in a season of short, joyful abundance, he commanded the people to whom nothing is prepared! Does not the like reference to the necessities of his colored inhabitants, whether in the prompt correction of numerous evils, any of their deep and cruel wrongs are to be redressed; and whether the benefits which the Legislature of our State is expected to scatter so profusely in its approaching session, will be like to reach to their unblest lot? It may not be proper to put the question to any one member of the Legislature—but, if it can be, to whom can I put it more suitably than to one, who will carry it to the councils of his state an influence proportionate to his character, as a statesman and a scholar?

I took up my pen to ask you, whether, in all the plans of legislative relief and advantage, which are arousing such joyful expectation throughout our communities, there is no reference to the necessities of its colored inhabitants, whether in the prompt correction of numerous evils, any of their deep and cruel wrongs are to be redressed; and whether the benefits which the Legislature of our State is expected to scatter so profusely in its approaching session, will be like to reach to their unblest lot? It may not be proper to put the question to any one member of the Legislature—but, if it can be, to whom can I put it more suitably than to one, who will carry it to the councils of his state an influence proportionate to his character, as a statesman and a scholar?

It is fit to be peculiarly mindful of the need, when we are unusually blessed ourselves. So thought Nehemiah, when in a season of short, joyful abundance, he commanded the people to whom nothing is prepared! Does not the like reference to the necessities of his colored inhabitants, whether in the prompt correction of numerous evils, any of their deep and cruel wrongs are to be redressed; and whether the benefits which the Legislature of our State is expected to scatter so profusely in its approaching session, will be like to reach to their unblest lot? It may not be proper to put the question to any one member of the Legislature—but, if it can be, to whom can I put it more suitably than to one, who will carry it to the councils of his state an influence proportionate to his character, as a statesman and a scholar?

After some further observations, Mr. Smith re-

marks, “that Southern slaveholders who cling to

slavery, (and such are ninety-nine hundredths of them,) desire the deepest debasement of the colored

population of the North, inasmuch as such debasement gives the greatest efficiency to the main ar-

gument for justifying slavery—the argument, that the colored man is incapable of enjoying and im-

proving the boon of freedom.” He then specifies

We are verily guilty concerning our brother • • • • therefore is this distress come upon us.

CINCINNATI, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1838.

WHOLE NO. 105.

Virginia, Chairman, reported “that until the adjoining states act on the subject (slavery) it would be” (not unconstitutional, but) “unwise and impolitic if not unjust for Congress to interfere.” In April, 1836, a special committee on abolition memorials reported the following resolutions by the Chairman, Mr. Pinckney of South Carolina: “Resolved, That Congress possesses no constitutional authority to interfere in any way with the institution of slavery in any of the states of this confederacy.”

“Resolved, That Congress ought not to interfere in any way with slavery in the District of Columbia.” “Ought not to interfere,” carefully avoiding the phraseology of the first resolution, and thus in effect conceding the constitutional power.

In a widely circulated “Address to the electors of the Charleston District,” Mr. Pinckney is thus denominated by his own constituents. “He has proposed a resolution which is received by the plain common sense of the whole country as a concession that Congress has authority to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.” (Journal H. R., 1829—30, p. 358.)

March 8, 1828, Mr. A. H. Sheppard, of North Carolina, presented a memorial of citizens of that state, “praying Congress to take measures for the entire abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.” (Journal H. R. 1829—30, p. 279.)

January 14, 1822. Mr. Rhea, of Tennessee, presented a memorial of citizens of that state, praying that provision may be made whereby all slaves which may hereafter be born in the District of Columbia, shall be free at a certain period of their lives.” (Journal H. R., 1821—22, p. 142.)

December 13, 1824. Mr. Saunders, of North Carolina, presented a memorial of citizens of that state, praying “that measures may be taken for the gradual abolition of slavery in the United States.” (Journal H. R., 1824—25 p. 27.)

December 16, 1828. “Mr. Barnard presented the memorial of the American Convention for promoting the abolition of slavery, held at Baltimore, praying that slavery may be abolished in the District of Columbia.” (Journal U. S. Senate, 1828—29, p. 34.)

6. It has been conceded by the *citizens of the District*. A petition for the gradual abolition of slavery in the District, signed by nearly eleven hundred of its citizens, was presented to Congress, March 24, 1837. Among the signers to this petition, were Chief Justice Cranch, Judge Van Ness, Judge Morse, Prof. J. M. Stoughton, Rev. Dr. Balch, Rev. Dr. Keith, John M. Moore, and a large number of the most influential inhabitants of the District. Mr. Dickson of New York, asserted on the floor of Congress in 1835, that the signers of this petition owned more than half of the property in the District; the accuracy of this statement has never been questioned.

This power has been conceded by the *grand juries of the District*. The grand jury of the county of Alexandria at the March term 1802, presented to the court the following resolution: “We consider this grievance demanding legislative redress.” January 19, 1829, Mr. Alexander, of Virginia, presented a representation of the grand jury in the city of Washington, remonstrating against “any measure for the abolition of slavery within said District, unless accompanied by measures for the removal of the emancipated from the same;” thus not only conceding the power to emancipate slaves, but affirming an additional power, that of excluding them when free. See Journal H. R. 1828—9, p. 17.

This power has been conceded by *grand juries of the District*. The grand jury of the county of Alexandria at the March term 1802, presented to the court the following resolution: “We consider this grievance demanding legislative redress.” January 19, 1829, Mr. Alexander, of Virginia, presented a representation of the grand jury in the city of Washington, remonstrating against “any measure for the abolition of slavery within said District, unless accompanied by measures for the removal of the emancipated from the same;” thus not only conceding the power to emancipate slaves, but affirming an additional power, that of excluding them when free. See Journal H. R. 1828—9, p. 17.

4. This power has been conceded by *State Legislatures*. In 1828, the Legislature of Pennsylvania instructed their Senators in Congress “to procure, if practicable, the passage of a law to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.” Jan. 28, 1829, the House of Assembly of New York, passed a resolution that their “Senators in Congress be instructed to make every possible exertion to effect the passage of a law for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.” In February, 1837, the Senate of Massachusetts, “resolved, That Congress having exclusive legislation in the District of Columbia, is now entitled to the power to abolish slavery in the District.”

5. It has been conceded by distinguished statesmen and jurists in the slaveholding states. The testimony of Messrs. Doddridge, Powell and Alexander, of Virginia, Chief Justice Cranch, and Judges Morsell and Van Ness, of the District, has already been given. To these may be added the following. In March, JOHN RANDOLPH introduced a resolution for putting a stop to the domestic slave trade within the District. December 12, 1827, Mr. BARNEY, of Maryland, presented a memorial for abolition in the District, and moved that it be printed. Mr. McDUFFIE, of South Carolina, objected to the printing, but “expressly admitted the right of Congress to grant to the people of the District any measures which they might deem necessary to free themselves from the deplorable evil.”

—See letter of Mr. Clarendon, of Mississippi to his constituents, published in the Washington Globe, May 9, 1836. The sentiments of Henry Clay on this subject are well known. In a speech before the United States Senate, in 1828, he declared the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District “unquestionable.” Messrs. Blair, of Tennessee, Chilton, Lyon and Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, A. H. Sheppard of North Carolina, Messrs. Armstrong and Smyth, of Virginia, Messrs. Dorsey, Archer, and Barney, of Maryland, and Johns, of Delaware, with numerous others from slave states, have asserted the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District. In the debate on the trial held at the Court of Common Pleas, in the case of the colored woman Matilda, who was brought before the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County, Ohio, by writ of habeas corpus, on the 8th or 9th of March, 1828, the woman was arraigned upon the 8th or 9th of March, as a fugitive slave, upon the oath of John W. Riley, agent of Larin Lawrence, Missouri. She was taken before a Justice of the Peace, and upon the request of her counsel for more time, was committed to jail to await a further trial. While in jail, the writ of habeas corpus issued, and an attempt was made to procure her release on various grounds; among which were, a non-conformance by the magistrate and claimant to the U. S. Laws; and also, the unconstitutionality of that law itself.

Upon the trial, the Court held the nominal proceedings of the Justice and Constable to be valid; but as the Constable was also the agent, (Riley,) it was held, that what had been done was right, and that the writ of habeas corpus was illegal.

The woman was released upon the 8th or 9th of March, as a fugitive slave, upon the oath of John W. Riley, agent of Larin Lawrence, Missouri. She was taken before a Justice of the Peace, and upon the request of her counsel for more time, was committed to jail to await a further trial. While in jail, the writ of habeas corpus issued, and an attempt was made to procure her release on various grounds; among which were, a non-conformance by the magistrate and claimant to the U. S. Laws; and also, the unconstitutionality of that law itself.

With respect to the constitutionality of the United States Law, the Court said, that it was too late to discuss that question; the law was passed in 1793, and had been ever since upon, and recognised by State Legislatures—and it must now be held constitutional. In making this decision, we presume the Court had in mind the opinions which many eminent men have expressed, that a course of legislation may properly settle the constitutionality of certain powers rather than disclaim any, for fear of giving an instrument of power to those who might abuse it.

But these opinions never went the length of saying, that a course of legislation in direct opposition to the Constitution, could make the laws thus passed constitutional; and before any Court can use, justly, this doctrine of pre-emption, it must show that the law in question does not directly conflict with any provision of that instrument, by which all laws must be tested.

In the case before us, Mr. Chase, who appeared for the colored woman, and in a speech of clear argument, and bold but impartial feeling,—laid bare a state of things that could exist only with regard to Africans—claimed, not only that Congress had no power to pass any law on the subject of retaking fugitive slaves, but also, that the existing law began here? Within the ten miles square you have undoubtedly power to exercise exclusive legislation.

Produce a bill to emancipate the slaves in the District of Columbia, or, if you prefer it, to emancipate those born hereafter.

In the debate on the memorial of the Society of Friends, in 1790, Mr. Madison, in speaking of the territories of the United States, explicitly declared, from his own knowledge of the views of the members of the Convention that framed the Constitution, as well as from the obvious import of its terms, that in the territories “Congress have certainly the power to regulate the subject of slavery.”—Congress can have no more power over the territories than that of “exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever,” consequently, according to Mr. Madison, “has certainly the power to regulate the subject of slavery in the” District.

Finally, we present the testimony of the present Vice President of the United States, Hon. Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky. In a speech before the United States Senate, February 1, 1820, he says: “Resolved, That Congress has the express power stipulated by the Constitution, to exercise exclusive legislation over the District of ten miles square. Here slavery is still sanctioned by law. In the District of Columbia, containing a population of 30,000 souls, and probably as many slaves as the whole territory of Missouri, the power of providing for their emancipation rests with Congress alone.” Why, then, let me ask Mr. President, why all this sensibility—this commiseration—this heart rending sympathy for the slaves of Missouri, and this cold insensibility, this eternal apathy, towards the slaves in the District of Columbia?

It is quite unnecessary to add, that the most distinguished northern statesmen of both political parties, have always affirmed the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District. February 1836, the Virginia Legislature passed unanimously the following resolution: “Resolved, That Congress have the full power by the constitution to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and in the territories.” The Legislature of Vermont passed in substance the same resolution, at its session in 1836.

May 30, 1836, a committee of the Pennsylvania Legislature reported the following resolution: “Resolved, That Congress does possess constitutional power, and it is expedient to abolish slavery and the slave trade within the District of Columbia.”

In January, 1836, the Legislature of South Carolina, “Resolved, That we should consider the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia as a violation of the rights of the citizens of that District, which was ceded to the General Government.” Instead of denying the constitutional power, they virtually admit its existence, by striving to smother it under “implied conditions.” In February, 1836, the legislature of North Carolina “Resolved, That although by the constitution the legislative power over the District of Columbia is vested in the Congress of the United States, yet we would deprecate any legislative action on the part of that body towards the slaves of that District, as a breach of faith towards those States by whom the territory was originally ceded, and will only be restrained as the first step towards a general emancipation of the slaves of the South.”

Here is a full concession of the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District. February 1836, the Virginia Legislature passed unanimously the following resolution: “Resolved by the General Assembly of Virginia, that the following article be proposed to the several states of this Union, and to Congress, as an amendment of the Constitution of the United States: ‘The powers of Congress shall not be so construed as to authorize the passage of any law for the emancipation of slaves in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the proprietors thereof.’”

In January, 1836, the Legislature of South Carolina, “Resolved, That we should consider the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia as a violation of the rights of the citizens of that District, which was ceded to the General Government.” Instead of denying the constitutional power, they virtually admit its existence, by striving to smother it under “implied conditions.” In February, 1836, the legislature of North Carolina “Resolved, That although by the constitution the legislative power over the District of Columbia is vested in the Congress of the United States, yet we would deprecate any legislative action on the part of that body towards the slaves of that District, as a breach of faith towards those States by whom the territory was originally ceded, and will only be restrained as the first step towards a general emancipation of the slaves of the South.”

It is quite unnecessary to add, that the most distinguished northern statesmen of both political parties, have always affirmed the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District. February 1836, the Virginia Legislature passed unanimously the following resolution: “Resolved, That Congress have the full power by the constitution to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and in the territories.” The Legislature of Vermont passed in substance the same resolution, at its session in 1836.

States: How then can Congress legislate on the subject? Is there any power bestowed on Congress by the Constitution to care who into what country a fugitive from justice goes? To carry into execution a law to have it proved that he is not a fugitive fugitive from labor? If the precedent relied on by the Court in this case have any weight, it must be because it has gone upon the ground that there was some such power; as in those well-known cases where concurrence of opinion has settled the constitutionality of some point, it has been upon the basis that some power directly given to the government, could not be carried into execution without the law then under debate; that is, the opinion settled—not the existence of a power, but the necessity of a certain law to carry into execution a power plainly given. Now, if any Court can find a power which it cannot be carried into execution without a law, concluding fugitives from justice, it may, as the United States Court does, lay down the doctrine of precedent from continued legislation, but not otherwise.

J. H. P.

TWENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS. SECOND SESSION.

From the *National Intelligencer*.

DEBATE IN THE SENATE.

Wednesday, January 10, 1838.

ON MR. CALHOUN'S RESOLUTIONS.

The Senator resented the consideration of these resolutions, together with the substitute offered by Mr. CLAY, of Kentucky.

Mr. CALHOUN modified his substitute by striking out what related to the infringement of the Constitution by abolition in the District of Columbia and the Territories.

This speech is supported by the provision respecting public records, already referred to. Both of the two first sections of the fourth article, are to determine what shall be given in each State to the citizens of all other, and authorizes Congress to regulate by law, the proof and effect of such records.

Mr. CALHOUN said he had this power without this express authority? No one can think it. Well, the second section says, first—that the citizens of each State shall have the privileges of citizens in all the States; next, that a person flying from a State, where he is charged with crime, to another, shall be delivered up to the Executive of the State whence he fled; and last, that no person bound to serve in one State, shall fly to another; and by any law thereof, be released from his obligation; but shall be delivered up to the party entitled to his services; and here the whole subject is dropped; no power is given to Congress to pass laws, or to the government in any shape. The purpose of these two sections was to place these subjects, so far as the States were concerned, upon a perfect basis, and to put them out of the way of objections. There are in the nature of a treaty between independent governments; and having settled that certain things shall and shall not do, leave it with these governments to say by law, how they shall or shall not be; making, however, one exception, and with respect to one subject, giving the law-making power to a third party; which exception, if there had been any doubt before, would surely prove that where the third party was not expressly ordered to regulate the manner of doing or preventing the things spoken of, beyond doubt, the power of regulation should remain with the two interested parties. (Chase's speech, 19, 20, 21.)

Moreover, that these provisions are in the nature of a

treaty, is known by the fact that all them, but this respecting fugitives from labor, were in the old articles of Confederation; they are now in the Federal Government, and power, is given to the states to regulate by law.

Then the clause respecting records stood without any law-making power attached to it. When the Constitution was formed, Congress were empowered to legislate on this subject; while the others remained as before, and a new clause was added in the form which the whole had under the old confederation.

These considerations, urged with great force by Mr. Chase, seem to us unanswerable. But we have another point yet to consider. It is this. Even if Congress has a constitutional right to legislate respecting fugitives from labor, is the existing law constitutional?

Of this law we have as yet given no account; but of all the legislative monsters that disgrace American statute books, this is surely one of the strangest and vilest.—Act of Feb. 12, 1793, §. 5. By this act the claimant of any fugitive from labor, may seize said alleged fugitive, without writ or legal authority of any kind, take him or her before any Justice of the Peace of any city, town, or county; and having by written or oral evidence, or affidavit, established to the satisfaction of the Justice, his claim, he shall be granted a certificate, under which he may carry the alleged fugitive from the State, and no one may intercede.

The person arrested or seized has no time given him to collect witnesses given, no power of cross-examination, no jury or board of magistrates to hear the cause, no appeal, no right to a new trial in any form.

The Justice receives no pay from the United States, but must look to the claimant, and may receive a thousand dollars as a fee.

He cannot be removed for what he does as a Federal officer, and he stands irresponsible, bailed by the law to take bribes, vested with the power of judging instantly, upon *ex parte* evidence, upon the oath of one interested man, and authorized to decide finally and forever upon the freedom, probably the personal freedom, of the slave.

It can be argued that in this country such a power will be rarely exercised. We must answer, that it is exercised continually. Since we began this article, we have heard of a case, when it was shown in all its excellence, A mulatto boy, who had been in the service of a barber at Cincinnati, for a year or more, was one morning, while shaving a customer, laid hold of and carried off to the Magistrate's, as a fugitive from labor. His master went to an attorney and asked him to hurry, and try to help the lad; he went, found that the Magistrate had been unable to attend to the case, and had sent the party to another Justice; the lawyer hastened to him—he had been unable to hear the case also, and the claimant and colored boy had crossed the street to the Mayor's; to the Mayor he went in time—to see the certificate posted, and was surprised to find the youth to hopeless servitude!

It needs no argument to prove that this law, which invests the lowest judicial individuals of our country with a process more summary, one-sided, final, and unquestionable, than any other known among us, and that too, with respect to an almost certain loss of freedom,—is utterly opposed to the whole spirit of our Constitution and laws. The Star-Chamber of Elizabeth was far less fearful, far less anti-republican; and had thine been put into execution against white instead of blacks, it could not have stood one year. But it is not only opposed to the purpose of our Constitution, but is also to the welfare of their parents.

"That of the right to be free, is the right of all men," says:

"The right of the people to be free, is the right of all men."

Against these clauses shall not withstand; and no man shall stand but upon probable cause, supported by clear evidence."

(Do. Art. 5.) And again: "No person shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law."

(Do. Art. 5.) If these clauses have force or meaning, the law under consideration is wholly unconstitutional. Let no one say that because the law in this case makes the individual arrest the proper proceeding, that therefore this is legal process; those words have a technical meaning, and the reference to the warrant shows that the Constitution used them in that meaning.

So stand the Constitution and laws of the United States, respecting blacks claimed as run-away slaves; for upon the weight of suffering itself. Let us then consider of enacting our impudent, like power, a like power given as representation.

For instance, a white and black live side by side, equally respectable and industrious. A man comes to town and accuses the black of being a slave—of having been unfortunate, not criminal; he is taken at once, convicted upon the oath of his accuser, and delivered up to slavery.

Another person accuse the white of having been guilty of burglary; suppose the law authorized him convicted at once by affidavit, without cross-examination, and without time to give counter-evidence; and allowed the magistrate to send him to Louisiana in charge of his accuser, to prove his innocence he could, but he had to go to the South, unless he could prove it; and held too with all the disadvantages of the slave labor system.

What would the suitors of the laws of Austria say to such a law as this?

And should the white accused of crime, fare better than the black accused of misfortune? But the black is claimed as property, it is said. Well, and the claimant is opposed by the black as counter-claimant: he is both property and owner.

And what should we say of the law that should allow the Mississippian to come here, claim a white man's whole wealth, establish his claim by an oath, and carry it home with him? This is done in the case of the black considered as property.

But it is said again: the alleged fugitive from justice from another State, is claimed from us, and we deliver him to the law of the United States have without scruple; and we have no right to think the black will not be tried fairly, when we deliver him up, than that the accused criminal will not be.

To this we need but say, that the Executive of a State, or the State itself claims and takes in one instance; a private individual in the other; and that we do know that in all the slave states, the white criminal stands an infinitely better chance to have justice done him, than a black held as a slave under a certificate from the magistrate of a free state, does to obtain freedom. And as citizens of the United States, at men and Christians, we have no right to shut our eyes on this knowledge: If we do so, on the ground that we are called on to know the laws of other States, and the freedom of the slaves, we are then, as it were, aiding and abetting that which is done in the case of the black considered as property.

But it is said again: the alleged fugitive from justice from another State, is claimed from us, and we deliver him to the law of the United States have without scruple; and we have no right to think the black will not be tried fairly, when we deliver him up, than that the accused criminal will not be.

To this we need but say, that the Executive of a State, or the State itself claims and takes in one instance; a private individual in the other; and that we do know that in all the slave states, the white criminal stands an infinitely better chance to have justice done him, than a black held as a slave under a certificate from the magistrate of a free state, does to obtain freedom.

And as citizens of the United States, at men and Christians, we have no right to shut our eyes on this knowledge: If we do so, on the ground that we are called on to know the laws of other States, and the freedom of the slaves, we are then, as it were, aiding and abetting that which is done in the case of the black considered as property.

This agitation has produced one happy effect at least; it has brought the South to look into the nature and character of this great institution, and to correct many false impressions that even had entertained in relation to it.

Many in the South once believed that it was a moral and political evil; that folly and delusion are gone; we see it now in its true light, and regard it as the most safe and stable basis for free institutions in the world. It is impossible with us that the conflict can take place between labor and capital, which makes it so difficult to establish and maintain free institutions in all wealthy and highly civilized nations. Such institutions as ours do not exist.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the present occasion, further than to state that the first part of the amendment which had been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. NILES,) as modified by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he wished to inquire if the question was not divisible.

The Vice President replied that, according to parliamentary rules, the question, at its present stage, was not divisible.

Mr. BUCHANAN said that he did not intend to make any remarks upon the

negro woman, the handsomest I ever saw. She grasped a little child in her arms, and, as she wept, and silently gazed in anguish on its face, her child, as if conscious of its mother's situation, clung yet more closely to her neck. They bid her off.

I turned from the scene with feelings of disgust and horror, never, I hope, to be experienced again.

In conclusion, I observed that though the leading men at the South wish to keep out all discussion, there is yet an appetite among the people for information on the subject of slavery, so eager, that they seize upon every scrap of information which they can reach. And it is my opinion that any system of means which can be devised will reach the conscience of the slaveholder, and affect the system of slavery, it is the system which the abolitionists have now in use. I have heard some Southerners call it the voice of religion.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI:

Tuesday Morning, February, 13, 1838.

TO MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—The Philanthropist sent to members of the General Assembly, not with any intention of obliging them to become subscribers, but simply that they may be furnished with information on a question, which in some of its bearings they will of course have to consider. Those who do not wish to receive it, will please return it, with their names, and writing "refused" on the margin. A few individuals have returned the paper without their names.

OHIO LEGISLATURE.

SENATE.—Jan. 29th, presented by Mr. Stokely, at certain proceedings of the Society of Friends, at their late yearly meeting. By Mr. King a petition on the subject of slavery and the disqualifications of persons of color. Appropriately referred.

Jan. 30th, by Mr. Morris, a petition praying the extension of the right of trial by Jury to every person within the state whose liberty may be in jeopardy.

Feb. 2nd, by Mr. Thomas, praying the repeal of all laws imposing restrictions on people of color.

Feb. 3d, by Mr. Stokely, a petition from Hanan Griffith and 23 females of Jefferson county, praying that this Legislature protest against the annexation of Texas to the United States; also the petition of Pinkney Lewis and 48 men of Seneca county, on the same subject. [Laid on the table.] Also, the petition of Samuel Hopper and 85 other citizens of Jefferson and Belmont counties, praying a repeal of all laws making oppressive distinctions against the colored population of this state; also the petition of Mary Wildman and 80 females of Jefferson and Belmont counties, praying the abrogation of the same prohibitory laws; also the petition of Samaria T. Robinson and 23 females of Jefferson county, praying this Legislature to adopt resolutions declaring that Congress have the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories of the United States, and requesting Congress to exercise those powers. Appropriately referred.

Feb. 5th, by Mr. King, petitions praying the repeal of all laws imposing restrictions on persons on account of color.

Feb. 7th, by Mr. King, from citizens of Trumbull, petitions in relation to the resolution of the House of Representatives respecting abolition petitions.

House. Jan. 29th, Petitions presented by Mr. Lee relative to Texas and trial by jury. By Mr. Trevitt for a law for the suppression of mobs. By Mr. Foot in relation to slavery petitions.

Jan. 30th, by Messrs. Wetmore and Smucker, relatives to Texas, &c.

Feb. 1st, by Mr. Codding several in relation to colored people, trial by jury, Texas, &c.

Feb. 2nd, by Mr. McCune, remonstrating against any action upon the petitions in relation to the colored population and slavery in other states. By Mr. Chambers for a law to protect property against mobs. By Mr. Kelly, in relation to colored people, trial by jury, &c.

Feb. 3rd, by Mr. Crew in relation to slavery in the District. By Mr. Kendall in relation to the Clermont audience.

Feb. 5th, by Mr. Foote, in relation to the reception of slavery petitions by Congress. Also, by Mr. McCune, on the same subject.

Feb. 7th, Mr. COLLINGS reported, in reference to the various petitions on the subject of the colored population. Mr. FOOTE, in behalf of the minority of the Committee, made a counter report, on the subject of the laws preventing colored persons from giving evidence against whites. The reports were laid on the table. We have not yet seen them.

Mr. DUNLEVY of the select committee to whom was referred the Governor's communication relative to the abduction of the colored woman from Clermont county, has made a report. We are not informed as to its character.

On motion of Mr. Buchanan, the bill to provide for compensation for damage done by mobs, was taken up and postponed till the first Monday in December next.

We have gleaned the foregoing particulars from the Ohio Political Register.

Hon. Caleb Cushing will accept our thanks for several valuable and interesting papers—Also,

Hon. Charles Naylor.

In that portion of the debate published in today's paper, many strange things will be found.

Slaveholders have everything their own way.

Mr. Calhoun's doctrine is, that the slaveholding community is the grand conservator of the peace of the Union. Slavery is just that very principle, which is to save the North from the ruinous consequences, about to result from a fearful conflict between labor and capital;—slavery in the South is to keep steady the Union, when the North shall be rocked to and fro by insurrection;—slavery in the South prevents labor and capital in the North from acting aggressively on each other. When the working-man would encroach on the employer, slavery stretches forth its hand, and lo! the balance is restored—harmony reigns. When the capitalist would oppress the working-man, slavery rebuked the oppressor, and, behold! oppression ceaseth—the employer is compelled to be just.

Think of that!—We are not joking; look and see.

We had not room last week to direct the attention of our readers to Mr. Davis' speech. It is a masterly exposition of the supremacy of slaveholding influence in the councils of this nation.

We find little room now-a-days for our own lucubrations. In our next two or three numbers, we will endeavor to accommodate correspondents. We have some interesting reports from Societies; they shall appear in our next.

Our readers will have a chance to note how Mr. Clay conducts himself. Read carefully. The man who properly appreciates the value of free institutions and liberal principles, will find them in his conduct on this occasion to admire.

Mr. ALLEN deserves particular attention. He seemed very grateful to his kind friends in the South for clearing a ground on which he and his fellow-Senators from the North might stand! He certainly was under great obligations to Messrs. Calhoun and Clay for framing a creed for him and his brethren. Heaven help them! He and his brethren from the free states longed "to be placed on such a foundation as to be able to defend themselves from attacks at home on this irritating subject!" And Mr. Allen's was the true foundation! Mr. Allen's childlike dependence must have appeared very amiable. After all, it is a melancholy affair, that Northern Senators should have run to shelter beneath the broad wing of the South. The "cluck" of slavery has a wondrous power in it.

"Better late than never." At length Mr. Webster! His stand is a firm one. But why did he not take it sooner? What he says is unsavory; but what of that? Slavery rules by force, not by reason.

JURY TRIAL.—The Michigan Observer states, that the committee of the Legislature, to whom had been referred petitions on the subject of the right of trial by jury, reported, that, in their opinion this right is amply secured to every citizen by the constitution of the United States, and the laws and constitution of Michigan, and further legislation was needless. The report was adopted by a vote of 28 to 18! but some of the members who had voted for it reflecting a little, a motion for reconsideration was immediately made and carried. The subject was then recommitted to the judiciary committee. "We are happy to perceive," says the Observer, "that there are many friends of humanity in our Legislature. The above reconsideration and recommitment furnish delightful evidence of the fact."

SOCIETY IN WORTHINGTON, OHIO.—There is an Anti-Slavery Society in Worthington, Ohio, never reported. It numbers 68 members. President, John Smith; secretary, Dr. Skinner. It is auxiliary to the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society.

ALTON RIOT.—An interesting account of the trials of those persons connected with the Alton riot is copied into this day's paper from the Alton Telegraph. It will be seen that the testimony is clear and decisive; that the firing began with the assailants. Two guns were fired from the outside of the house, before any were fired from within. Another thing will be seen, and that is, that Alton richly deserves still severer execrations than have yet been thundered against her. Read the account of the trials. The incendiaries and murderers were clearly convicted by the testimony, and did not even attempt to invalidate a single point in it; but an Alton jury dared, in the face of earth and heaven, to bring in a verdict "Not Guilty!"

General Assembly of Rhode Island.

Mr. Bowen presented a memorial from Elizabeth, P. Webster et al. in relation to slavery and the inhumanity of the colored population from the District of Columbia, and also praying for the alteration of certain statutes of Rhode Island, complaining in an especial manner of the feature in our laws which recognizes a distinction of color.—To this memorial were attached nearly two thousand names.

It was referred to a select committee, consisting of Messrs. Bowen, Barber, and Randall, of North Providence.

On the 2d, Mr. Clark et al. from Hannah Sisson et al., referring to the resolution lately passed by the House of Representatives of the United States, in relation to Slavery and the right of Petition.

The memorial was referred to the same Committee as that of Elizabeth P. Webster.

The memorial of Poleg Clark et al. on the same subjects, referred to same Committee.

ASHTABULA SOCIETY.—The Anti-Slavery Society of Ashtabula co., convened in Morgan, Jan. 16. A large assemblage of citizens was present. Rev. Messrs. Smith and Saunders addressed the meeting, and several spirited resolutions were passed. We copy a few from their report, published in the Ashtabula Sentinel:

Resolved,—That we will petition our legislature to pass resolutions immediately, condemning the recent unconstitutional resolution of Mr. Paton, which virtually destroys the right of petition, and also to pass a resolution requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence to have said resolution rescinded immediately; and that we will petition Congress to rescind said resolution.

Resolved,—That the spirit of Slavery which recently burst its barrier at Alton, Illinois, if not abolished, will stifle the voice of the people and the right of petition—silence our statements in our Legislative Halls—close the instructions from the pulpit, and utterly retard the progress of our holy religion.

Resolved,—That we deeply lament the loss of E. P. Lovejoy, our beloved brother and fellow-laborer in the cause of the oppressed and dumb, who fell a sacrifice to the violence of a ruthless mob.

Resolved,—That the resolutions recently introduced in the Senate of the United States, by the Hon. Thomas Morris, on the subject of the liberty of speech and the press, the right of the citizens to meet peacefully and petition Congress on any subject they may consider a grievance, and the solemn duty of Congress to receive such petitions and give them a respectful reference, merit our most cordial approbation, and, we believe, also the approval of a large proportion of his constituents.

Resolved,—That the executive committee are requested to appoint delegates to attend the State Anti-Slavery Convention, to be held next spring.

A collection was taken up, and the result was a liberal contribution in aid of the cause.

FREE STATE LEGISLATION.—Of the members of the present legislature of Indiana, 88 are from slave states, 66 from free states, 2 Scotchmen, and 1 Irishman. We should like to see a tabular statement of the nativity, &c., of members of the legislatures in Ohio and Illinois. Illinois, we suppose, is pretty much as Indiana in this respect. It will be a difficult matter to reform our cruel policy with regard to the colored people, while we have so many men from slaveholding regions to legislate for us.

We had not room last week to direct the attention of our readers to Mr. Davis' speech. It is a masterly exposition of the supremacy of slaveholding influence in the councils of this nation.

We find little room now-a-days for our own lucubrations. In our next two or three numbers, we will endeavor to accommodate correspondents. We have some interesting reports from Societies; they shall appear in our next.

Our readers will have a chance to note how Mr. Clay conducts himself. Read carefully.

Whereas, in the opinion of the legislature, the annexation of Texas to the Union, would be unnecessarily extending the Territory of the United States, and create discontent among the people of the United States, therefore Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to vote against any measure which has for object the annexation of Texas to the Union, for the reasons above stated.

Resolved, That it is unnecessary and inexpedient to exercise any power of the constitutional power of Congress over slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the territories of the United States, or as to its power to prohibit the domestic slave trade.

On the next day, the report was adopted. Ayes, 42—

Nos. 4.

The Select Committee, to whom the subject was referred reported the following, which lie upon the table one day:

Whereas, in the opinion of the legislature, the annexation of Texas to the Union, would be unnecessarily extending the Territory of the United States, and create discontent among the people of the United States, therefore Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to vote against any measure which has for object the annexation of Texas to the Union, for the reasons above stated.

Resolved, That it is unnecessary and inexpedient to exercise any power of the constitutional power of Congress over slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the territories of the United States, or as to its power to prohibit the domestic slave trade.

On the next day, the report was adopted. Ayes, 42—

Nos. 4.

ANNEXATION OF TEXAS.

The Select Committee, to whom the subject was referred reported the following, which lie upon the table one day:

Whereas, in the opinion of the legislature, the annexation of Texas to the Union, would be unnecessarily extending the Territory of the United States, and create discontent among the people of the United States, therefore Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives, That our Senators in Congress be instructed and our Representatives requested to vote against any measure which has for object the annexation of Texas to the Union, for the reasons above stated.

Resolved, That it is unnecessary and inexpedient to exercise any power of the constitutional power of Congress over slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the territories of the United States, or as to its power to prohibit the domestic slave trade.

On the next day, the report was adopted. Ayes, 42—

Nos. 4.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI:

Tuesday Morning, February, 13, 1838.

TO MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.—The Philanthropist sent to members of the General Assembly, not with any intention of obliging them to become subscribers, but simply that they may be furnished with information on a question, which in some of its bearings they will of course have to consider. Those who do not wish to receive it, will please return it, with their names, and writing "refused" on the margin. A few individuals have returned the paper without their names.

OHIO LEGISLATURE.

SENATE.—Jan. 29th, presented by Mr. Stokely, at certain proceedings of the Society of Friends, at their late yearly meeting. By Mr. King a petition on the subject of slavery and the disqualifications of persons of color. Appropriately referred.

Jan. 30th, by Mr. Morris, a petition praying the extension of the right of trial by Jury to every person within the state whose liberty may be in jeopardy.

Feb. 2nd, by Mr. Thomas, praying the repeal of all laws imposing restrictions on people of color.

Feb. 3d, by Mr. Stokely, a petition from Hanan Griffith and 23 females of Jefferson county, praying that this Legislature protest against the annexation of Texas to the United States; also the petition of Pinkney Lewis and 48 men of Seneca county, on the same subject. [Laid on the table.] Also, the petition of Samuel Hopper and 85 other citizens of Jefferson and Belmont counties, praying a repeal of all laws making oppressive distinctions against the colored population of this state; also the petition of Mary Wildman and 80 females of Jefferson and Belmont counties, praying the abrogation of the same prohibitory laws; also the petition of Samaria T. Robinson and 23 females of Jefferson county, praying this Legislature to adopt resolutions declaring that Congress have the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories of the United States, and requesting Congress to exercise those powers. Appropriately referred.

Feb. 5th, by Mr. King, petitions praying the repeal of all laws imposing restrictions on persons on account of color.

Feb. 7th, by Mr. King, from citizens of Trumbull, petitions in relation to the resolution of the House of Representatives respecting abolition petitions.

House. Jan. 29th, Petitions presented by Mr. Lee relative to Texas and trial by jury. By Mr. Trevitt for a law for the suppression of mobs. By Mr. Foot in relation to slavery petitions.

Jan. 30th, by Messrs. Wetmore and Smucker, relatives to Texas, &c.

Feb. 1st, by Mr. Codding several in relation to colored people, trial by jury, Texas, &c.

Feb. 2nd, by Mr. McCune, remonstrating against any action upon the petitions in relation to the colored population and slavery in other states. By Mr. Chambers for a law to protect property against mobs. By Mr. Kelly, in relation to colored people, trial by jury, &c.

Feb. 3rd, by Mr. Crew in relation to slavery in the District. By Mr. Kendall in relation to the Clermont audience.

Feb. 5th, by Mr. Foote, in relation to the reception of slavery petitions by Congress. Also, by Mr. McCune, on the same subject.

Feb. 7th, Mr. COLLINGS reported, in reference to the various petitions on the subject of the colored population. Mr. FOOTE, in behalf of the minority of the Committee, made a counter report, on the subject of the laws preventing colored persons from giving evidence against whites. The reports were laid on the table. We have not yet seen them.

Mr. DUNLEVY of the select committee to whom was referred the Governor's communication relative to the abduction of the colored woman from Clermont county, has made a report. We are not informed as to its character.

On motion of Mr. Buchanan, the bill to provide for compensation for damage done by mobs, was taken up and postponed till the first Monday in December next.

We have gleaned the foregoing particulars from the Ohio Political Register.

Hon. Caleb Cushing will accept our thanks for several valuable and interesting papers—Also,

Hon. Charles Naylor.

In that portion of the debate published in today's paper, many strange things will be found.

Slaveholders have everything their own way.

Mr. Calhoun's doctrine is, that the slaveholding community is the grand conservator of the peace of the Union. Slavery is just that very principle, which is to save the North from the ruinous consequences, about to result from a fearful conflict between labor and capital;—slavery in the South is to keep steady the Union, when the North shall be rocked to and fro by insurrection;—slavery in the South prevents labor and capital in the North from acting aggressively on each other. When the working-man would encroach on the employer, slavery stretches forth its hand, and lo! the balance is restored—harmony reigns. When the capitalist would oppress the working-man, slavery rebuked the oppressor, and, behold! oppression ceaseth—the employer is compelled to be just.

Resolved,—That we earnestly recommend to each township A. S. Society, immediately to take measures to supply themselves with anti-slavery libraries for the benefit of both the poor and the wealthy.

Resolved,—That special

POETRY.

THE INFANTS DREAM.

The following appeared in the Londonderry Sentinel, June, 1820, and is here republished because of its great beauty and touching pathos.—*Presbyterian*.

Oh! cradle me on the knee, mamma,
And sing me the holy strain
That sooth'd me last, as you fondly prest
My glowing cheek to your soft white breast,
For I saw a scene when I slumbered last
That I fain would see again.

And smile as you then did smile, mamma,
And weep as you then did weep;
Then fix on me thy glint'ning eye,
And gaze, and gaze till the tear'd dry,
Then rock me gently, and sing and sigh
Till you lull me fast asleep.

For I dream'd a heavenly dream, mamma,
While slumbering on the knee,
And I lie'd in a land where forms divine
In kingdoms of glory eternally shine,
And the world I'd give, if the world were mine,
Again that land to see.

I fancied we roam'd in a wood, mamma,
And we rested, as under a bough;
Then near me a butterfly flaunted in pride,
And I chased it away through the forest wide,
And the night came on, and I lost my guide,
And I knew not what to do.

My heart grew sick with fear, mamma,
And I loudly wept for thee;
But a white rob'd maiden appear'd in the air,
And she flung back the curls of her golden hair,
And she kiss'd me so softly ere I was aware,
Saying, "Come, pretty babe, with me,"

My tears and fears she quell'd, mamma,
And she led me far away;
We enter'd the door of the dark, dark tomb;
We pass'd through a long lone vault of gloom,
Then open'd our eyes on a land of bloom,
And a sky of endless day.

And heavenly forms were there, mamma,
And lovely cherubs bright;
They smil'd when they saw me, but I was amaz'd,
And wondering, around me I gaz'd;
And songs I heard, and sunny beams blaz'd—
All glorious in the land of light.

But soon came a shining throng, mamma,
Of white-wing'd babes to me;
Their eyes look'd love, and their sweet lips smil'd,
And they marveld to meet with an earth-born child,
And they gloried that I from earth was exil'd—
Saying, "Here, love, blest shalt thou be."

Then I mix'd with the heavenly throng, mamma,
With cherub and seraphim fair;
And I saw, as I roan'd the regions of peace,
The spirits which came from this world of distress,
And there was the joy no tongue can express,
For they know no sorrow there.

Do you mind when sister Jane, mamma,
Lay dead a short time ago?
Oh! you gaz'd on the sad and lovely wreck,
With a full flood of woe you could not check,
And your heart was so sore, you wish'd it would break,
But it lov'd and you aye sobbed on!

But oh! had you been with me, mamma,
In the realms of unknown care,
And seen what I saw, you ne'er had cried,
Though they buried pretty Jane in the grave when she died;
For shining with the best, and adorn'd like a bride
Sweet sister Jane was there.

Do you mind of that silly old man, mamma,
Who came so late to our door,
And the night was dark, and the tempest loud,
And his heart was weak, but his soul was proud,
And his ragged old mantle serv'd for his shroud,
Ere the midnight watch was o'er!

And think what a weight of woe, mamma,
Made heavy long drawn sigh,
As the good man sat on papa's old chair,
While the rain drop'd down from his thin gray hair,
And the big tear of speechless care
Ran down from his glazing eye—

And think what a heavenward look, mamma,
Flash'd through each trembling eye,
As he told how he went to the baron's strong hold,
Saying "Oh! let me in for the night is so cold,"
But the rich man cried, "Go sleep in the wood,
For we shan't no beggars here."

Well! he was in glory too, mamma,
As happy as the best can be;
He needed no slums in the mansions of light,
For he sat with the patriarchs, cloth'd in white;
And there was not a seraph had a crown more bright,
Nor a costlier robe than he.

No sing, for I fain would sleep, mamma,
And dream as I dream'd before;
For sound was my slumber, and sweet was my rest,
While my spirit in the kingdom of life was a guest,
And the heart that has throbbed in the climes of the best
Can love the world no more."

MISCELLANEOUS.

Lectures to Artisans.

Dr. Beecher is now delivering a series of lectures to the artisans of Cincinnati, on the evidences of revealed religion, and the connection of Christianity with civil and religious liberty. His first discourse was published in the Cincinnati Gazette. We select from it two extracts.

"It is one thing to acquire blessings, and another to preserve them. 'Tis easier to amass wealth than to hold it—and 'tis easier to obtain liberty than to maintain it."

How to preserve liberty, "there's the rub."—Other nations have made themselves free, but their light of life has been like the meteor's glow, flashing athwart the horizon, and going down in endless night. Shall it be thus with us? Have we been called into the light of liberty, and shown what we may be, only to be thrust back into more terrible darkness? I trust not. I trust we shall shine brighter and brighter, till the nations, encouraged by our success, shall break their chains and walk erect and free upon the fair earth which God has given them.

When at first we set up for independence, kings, nobles, and priesthood stood against! They pitied us poor orphans who had no "church and state" to take care of us; they feared that we should all go back again to skins and acorns; but we have kept along for 50 years or more, and we have in that time made some bread stuff, some cloth, and considerable pork; and we have thoughts of trying it 50 years more—and if we stick to the good old way of "God and Liberty," I think we shall succeed.

Thus far we have done pretty well; but there are some, not many, I hope, though I fear there be who are not willing to let pretty well alone, and are anxious to try some experiments to make us more free and more happy than we have yet been.

They have discovered, they think, that there is no God! That the Bible is a fable! And they think that civil government is an usurpation—and

separate families and separate property are a curse—that it is a vile monopoly for a man to have any wife in particular, or for a son to know his own father! That *liberty* is the right of every man to do as he pleases—and *equality* the right of every man to be handsome, wise, and witty as his neighbor—the right to live in as fine a house—to dress as well, and eat and drink as much by *weight* and *measure*.

You all remember the fable of the dog who by grasping at the shadow of his marrow-bone, lost what he had, and gained nothing. Let us be careful lest in grasping at a shadow we lose our marrow-bone."

[When we hear much talk of the force of our example, as a free people, and its tendency to "break the chains" of European nations, we are reminded of a circumstance mentioned by the Duke of Saxe-Weimar in his travels. At New Orleans he met with a young lawyer, from Paris, of the name of Souliez. Souliez had involved himself in unpleasant circumstances in his own country, on account of certain very liberal productions of his pen. In consequence of this he left his home, brimful of liberal ideas, and went to Hayti. His fancy, however, being very much disappointed with the realities of this place, he removed to the United States. What was the result? It is told in the words of Saxe-Weimar:

"He now candidly confessed, that he was completely cured of his fine dreams of liberty!"

Another passage from the same author will show, that however sun-like we may fancy our example to be, foreigners are apt to think it rather cloudy. Speaking of the quadroons in Louisiana, he says—

"Several of these girls have inherited property from their fathers or friends, and possess handsome fortunes. Notwithstanding this, their situation is always very humiliating. They cannot drive through the streets in a carriage."

The whites have the privilege to procure these unfortunate creatures a whipping, like that inflicted on slaves, upon an accusation, proved by two witnesses. Several of these females have enjoyed the benefits of as careful an education as most of the whites; they conduct themselves ordinarily with more propriety and decorum, and confer more happiness on their friends, than many of the white ladies on their married lords. Still the white ladies constantly speak with the greatest contempt, and even with animosity, of these unhappy and oppressed beings. The strongest language of high nobility in the monarchies of the world, cannot be more haughty, overweening, or contemptuous towards their fellow-creatures, than the expressions of the creole females with regard to the quadroons, in one of the much-vaulted states of the free Union. In fact, such comparison strikes the mind of a thinking being very singularly. Many wealthy fathers, on account of the existing prejudices, send daughters of this description to France, where these girls, with a good education and property, find no difficulty in forming a legitimate establishment."

The following extract from the discourse will richly repay any one for reading it. We do not remember ever to have seen the absurdity of atheism hit off in a style at once so queer and conclusive.

The Being of a God.

"I. We remark in the beginning that it seems very desirable to have a God, provided we might have one all-wise, all-powerful, and perfectly benevolent, who should make us the subjects of his perfect government forever. In attempting therefore to prove the being of such a God, do I attempt to prove any thing against your wishes? Who wishes to have it proved to him that he is a mere animal, and that there is nothing beyond this life but eternal night? Who deprecates immortality unless he feels himself to be so wicked and so determined to continue thus, that it be better for him to be annihilated than to come into the presence of a God who is holy, just and good?

II. You cannot prove that there is no God—one attempts to do so. The most which is advanced is that we cannot prove there is one. So far then we are—but we shall soon see that there are some probabilities at least that there is a God—and if we believe there is one, it can do us no harm even if we are mistaken—but if we disbelieve, and act as if there were none, and it should be found afterward that there is a God, it will indeed be terrible.

But we expect to throw something into the scale more weighty than probability, and that Atheism will kick the beam.

III. The evidence of the being of a God is exactly what would be if there was a God. The evidence is from design—the wise adaptation of means to ends—every effect we say must have a cause—design is an effect—our bodies—the plants and the heavenly orbs we call effects, but to say that such effects as these—such designs—had not an intelligent designer, is as absurd as to say that there can be an effect without a cause.

If there be a God, an Almighty mind, that did create this universe, there could be no higher evidence of design than we now behold—all is as if there were a God—and there is no evidence to the contrary,—and what better evidence than this would any jury wish to a point alleged, that all the circumstances in the cause are as they would be if the thing supposed was true, and there is no contrary evidence to show it is not? Would they then how to decide?

But let us take some illustrations from human designs—and see how every mind decides upon them. Suppose we had before us an Orrery such as Rittenhouse made, in which we might witness the relative motions of each of the planets in the Solar system—and we should ask who made this wonderful thing? Would you say no—it came by chance? By an accident, combination of the parties of matter? You would say at once it was the result of mind?

But if this imitation of the Solar system proves a designing mind, how much more does the stupendous Orrery above proclaim the existence of an Almighty mind!

We ask the atheist whence came the Sun?—And he tells us that somehow some mud and water got together and forth sprang the Sun and all the heavenly host. It is David I think, who says the foul hate said in his heart there is no God—a wise man I think would not say so.

There is no evidence that the indication, above and around us are the results of accident. There is no historical evidence of men ever coming out from mud and water. There is no evidence that when the earth was soft, they began to crawl out of the slime like locusts, and as it began to harden, that they managed to get on their tal legs and run about.

But if such were the sport of nature, we should not find fragments, such as bodies without heads and legs, without bodies and heads and arms. For why should chance happen always to finish a thing? Even a designer may make some things by mistake—and you have scattered through your shop various fragments of designs. But nature's workmanship is perfect. And how happens it that she always works as if by design?

All the indications of design in the arts of life are traceable to intelligent minds. No one for a moment believes that saw-mills and steam boats were ever made by chance and had no designer.—The man who should wait for his bed and chairs to happen—and should stir up the mud and water to

produce them, would have to wait a great while—such accidents do not happen now-a-days.

Suppose I should ask who built that furnace—Would any of you answer, "nobody"? There was a mill pond there, and when it dried up somehow by chemical affinities this furnace came up out of the mud one night!" And who made that steam engine? I enquire "why nature when she saw she had a work shop thought she would try her hand at the arts. So she threw in the material, and kindled up the fire and out came this steam

engine?" We prove then the existence of the eternal mind just as we prove that of the human mind—an you prove yourself a rational being—so do I prove the being of a God. Give me now the arguments by which you will prove to me that you are a rational creature, and I will take those same arguments and prove an intelligent creator. Do you say we cannot see God—I say neither can I see you—I cannot look into your mind—but if you speak and write intelligently, or do any thing that indicates me, then I will believe you have a mind.

But if you deny that design proves a designer, then may I deny your rationality. But if you admit the argument as it regards yourself—you can't stop there with it, but it must go up with accumulating force, it is short but glorious—for it proves a God, a God over all blessed forever!"

Charity.

They have been the free and willing offerings of genuine charity—that of charity which is thrice blessed; which blesses him that gives, and him that takes;—of that charity which, with golden chain, links man to man and earth to heaven.

Without this capacity of benevolent emotion, what were man? See how carefully Milton, when drawing his sublime picture of the fallen angel, has excluded the sentiments of love.

Intelligence, almost boundless, constancy unalterable, courage that dared defy the Omnipotent, fidelity to his great host of fallen spirits, that never faltered nor swerved; but no benevolent affection.

On the contrary, in the horrid crater of his burning heart, the fires of his undying malevolence blazed and scorched with a fierceness to which the penal fires of his dread abode were but a feeble mockery.—The great truth which the poet designed to teach was doubtless this, that no being endowed with moral sentiments can be truly happy, except in the exercise of benevolent affections.

CHASE.

The Wyandots of Ohio.

An attempt was recently made by the federal government to deprive the Wyandot tribe of the little land they own in Ohio. They applied to their "old friend" Governor Vance, of Ohio, who, interesting himself in their behalf, "obtained from the Secretary of War an assurance that no treaty should be entered into but by the consent of the authorized agents of the nation." The following is a letter of thanks addressed to Governor Vance, by the chiefs of this noble tribe.

"Within a very short time," he said, "the Statistical Society of Manchester had published a report, from which it appeared that one-tenth of the population of the town *lived in cellars*, and it appeared that in the town of Liverpool about 34,000 persons lived in the same way." The statistics, of course furnished another test of the condition of the laboring classes in England.

"Within England and Wales the number of convictions in 1805 was 4,600; in 1810 they were 5,100; in 1815, 8,000; in 1821, 13,000; in 1828, 16,500; in 1831, 19,600; in 1832, 20,000; in 1833 the increase was considerable, and, he regretted to say, had gone on advancing to the present day. Having thus stated the vast increase which had taken place in crime throughout the more populous parts of the country, he should now call the attention of the House to some other details connected with the increased consumption of ardent spirits, or indeed still further to illustrate the lamentable condition of the poorer classes of society. The consumption of spirits in

1817 was 9,200,000 gallons

1827 18,230,000

1837 29,600,000

From which it appeared, that in the space of 20 years the amount of ardent spirits consumed in this kingdom had nearly trebled, while the population had increased only 33 per cent. or one-third.

In other words, the consumption of spirits had increased nine times faster than the population.

Every person of drinking age (above 12 years)

consumed on the average per annum 1½ gallons of raw spirits. But if the calculation were made on the consumers of spirits in the humbler classes in large towns, the proportion would be increased to nearly double what he had stated. And, looking to the disease, distress, and domestic misery which that poisoner of all comfort in the laboring classes of society necessarily entailed, he asked, was not such a state of things as he had described inconsistent with the welfare and happiness of the great body of the people in large towns?"

We shall always remember with pleasure the peace and friendship that have so long existed between us. We shall remember with pleasure the old chief of Ohio with whom our fathers smoked the pipe of peace—her Tiffins, Meigs, Harrisons, Womingtons, Browns, Morrows, Trumbles, M'Arthurs, Lucas, and many others we could mention.

Should it be the stern decree of the Great Spirit that we should follow the nations that have preceded us, to extinction, our last will will be that the name, WYANDOTT, may not share the same fate,

but be preserved by the sons of the first settlers of Ohio—that it may be perpetuated and identified with her history.

Wishing you, our old friend, and the people of Ohio generally, peace, health and happiness, we, in conclusion, would salute you in the bonds of affection.

JOHN BARNETT, Head Chief.
WILLIAM WALKER,
FRANCIS A. HICKS,
DOCT. GRAY EYEE,
RUSSELL HICKS,
SCUNDEENTEE,
TOUROOMEER,
Gen. Joseph Vance, Columbus, O.

COUNSELLORS.

EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

The following is a letter of the Statistical Society of Manchester to the Wyandot Indians.

"Sir, We have the honor to inform you that

the Wyandot Indians have received a copy of our

Report, and we trust will be pleased to receive

it with interest, as it contains a full account of

the laboring classes in England, and the state of

the working population in that country.

We trust that you will be gratified by the

information contained in it, and that it will be

useful to you in your efforts to improve the

condition of your people.

We trust that you will be gratified by the

information contained in it, and that it will be

useful to you in your efforts to improve the

condition of your people.

We trust that you will be gratified by the

information contained in it, and that it will be